

ATTACHMENT A

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being "anticipated by" the previously cited Veil et al ("Veil") reference. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite what is believed to be implicit in the previous amendment to claim 1. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the processor and the at least one peripheral both process all types of input data codes including any secure input data codes. The basic issue raised here is discussed in the "Response to Arguments" section of the current Office Action, particularly on page 3. As applicant has repeatedly pointed out and as the Examiner apparently admits, the method disclosed in the Veil reference provides for processing of secure or sensitive data in a coprocessor and for processing of nonsecure or nonsensitive data in the computer host. This is clearly not the case with the system of the present invention and it is believed that this distinction has been even more clearly brought out in the amendments made to claim 1. In this regard, claim 1 provides that both the processor and the computing peripheral of the system process all types of input data codes including any secure input data codes (as well as operands and rules of operation for each operation performed by the processor), albeit in a different way. It is believed that the amendment to claim 1 further underscores this important difference between Veil and the present invention as claimed in claim 1 and thus allowance of claim 1 and the claims dependent thereon is respectfully solicited. Applicant has carefully read the discussion of this point in the Office Action but, for at least the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the claim language clearly defines over Veil. If the Examiner disagrees, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner point out precisely how the language of claim 1 discussed above is met by the teachings of Veil.

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 1. Further, at least some of these claims are separately patentable. In addition, it is believed that new claims 10 and 11, added in this Amendment, are separately patentable over the teachings of the Veil patent.

Considering the latter point in more detail, claim 10 recites that the computer system automatically controls operation of public transport vehicles. This feature is

discussed in the specification at page 8, lines 31-35 and also at page 1. It is respectfully submitted that the Veil patent clearly does not disclose this feature.

Regarding claim 11, this claim recites that the at least one peripheral controls whether the processor itself is processing information input thereto in a secure way independently of whether input information processed by the processor is secure information. This feature is supported by the disclosure at, e.g., page 3 of the specification. It is respectfully submitted that this is a further clear distinction between the present invention and the disclosure of the Veil patent and, in this regard, in accordance with this feature, a determination as to whether the system is operating as intended is made not based on the input data (i.e., whether the input data are secure or sensitive data), but on the operation of the processor itself. Again, it is respectfully submitted that this feature is simply not disclosed by the Veil reference.

Allowance of the application in its present form is respectfully solicited.

END REMARKS